

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 705-7400
Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: 202-538-8000
Facsimile: 202-538-8100

Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER
CASTILLO, and MONIQUE TRUJILLO,
individually and on behalf of all similarly
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,
Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION TO COMPEL REGARDING
DISPUTE P3**

Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) respectfully seeks to seal certain portions of the Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Regarding Dispute P3 (“Opposition”) and Exhibit 1 of the Opposition, which contains non-public, sensitive confidential and proprietary business information that could affect Google’s competitive standing and may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed, including the various types of Google’s internal identifiers/cookies and their proprietary functions. The Court previously granted Google’s motions to seal the same or substantively similar information it seeks to seal now, including in Dkt. Nos. 152, 160, 172, 190. On the same bases, the Court also sealed the April 29, 2021 hearing (Dkt. No. 143), the April 29, 2021 hearing transcript (Dkt. No. 174), the June 2, 2021 hearing (Dkt. No. 183), and the June 2, 2021 hearing transcript (Dkt. No. 197). This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Opposition:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming Confidentiality
Opposition	Portions Highlighted in Yellow at 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Google
Ex. 1, Google’s May 24, 2021 Responses and Objections to Plaintiffs’ Notice of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition	Portions Highlighted in Yellow at 4, 8, 9	Google

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party seeking to seal material must “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are “compelling reasons” to seal the information. *See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a non-dispositive motion must show only “good cause.” *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower

1 standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that “the public has less of a need for access to
 2 court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated,
 3 or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action” and that as a result “[t]he public
 4 policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with
 5 equal force to non-dispositive materials.” *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179; *see also TVIIM, LLC v.*
 6 *McAfee, Inc.*, 2015 WL 5116721, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015) (“Records attached to non-
 7 dispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.”) (citation omitted). Under the
 8 “good cause” standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a company’s users, sales, investments,
 9 or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for competitive purposes. *See Hanginout, Inc. v.*
 10 *Google, Inc.*, 2014 WL 1234499, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2014); *Nitride Semiconductors Co. v.*
 11 *RayVio Corp.*, 2018 WL 10701873, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2018) (granting motion to seal
 12 “[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding [Defendant]’s products” under “good cause”
 13 standard) (Van Keulen, J.).

14 A discovery statement is non-dispositive, and thus the good cause standard applies. *See e.g.*
 15 *Pieterston v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, 2018 WL 10362631, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2018) (“The
 16 parties have filed two separate motions to seal portions of the discovery letter briefs that are pending
 17 before the Court. Because the sealing requests were made in conjunction with a non-dispositive
 18 discovery motion, a showing under the good cause standard will suffice.”). Although the materials that
 19 Google seeks to seal here easily meet the higher “compelling reasons” standard, the Court need only
 20 consider whether these materials meet the lower “good cause” standard.

21 **III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS EASILY MEET THE “GOOD CAUSE”** 22 **STANDARD AND SHOULD ALL BE SEALED**

23 Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain “business
 24 information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435
 25 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that
 26 “contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party’s] products and that public
 27 disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information.” *Digital Reg of*
 28 *Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that

1 could harm a litigant’s competitive standing may be sealed even under the “compelling reasons”
 2 standard. *See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc.*, 2015 WL 984121, at *2
 3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information “is appropriately sealable under the ‘compelling reasons’
 4 standard where that information could be used to the company’s competitive disadvantage”) (citation
 5 omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted as to
 6 potential trade secrets. *See, e.g., United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc.*, 2015 WL
 7 295584, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing “that [the party] ha[s] not
 8 shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret”).

9 Here, the Opposition and Exhibit 1 are comprised of confidential and proprietary information
 10 regarding highly sensitive features of Google’s internal systems and operations that Google does not
 11 share publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to the various types of Google’s
 12 internal identifiers/cookies and their proprietary functions. Such information reveals Google’s internal
 13 strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important
 14 services while complying with its legal and privacy obligations.

15 Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google’s competitive standing it
 16 has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of
 17 Google’s proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google’s competitors. That alone is a proper
 18 basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-
 19 BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google’s motion to seal certain sensitive
 20 business information related to Google’s processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of
 21 a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO,
 22 Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because “disclosure
 23 would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have”); *Trotsky v.*
 24 *Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at *8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal
 25 as to “internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publically available”).

26 Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to
 27 compromise Google’s internal identifier systems. Google would be placed at an increased risk of
 28 cyber security threats. *See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.*, 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal.

1 Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing “material concern[ing] how users’ interactions with the Gmail system affects
 2 how messages are transmitted” because if made public, it “could lead to a breach in the security of the
 3 Gmail system”). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified
 4 information.

5 The information Google seeks to redact, including the internal identifiers/cookies and their
 6 functionalities, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and
 7 operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may
 8 improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The “good cause” rather than the
 9 “compelling reasons” standard should apply but under either standard, Google’s sealing request is
 10 warranted.

11 **IV. CONCLUSION**

12 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of the Opposition and
 13 Exhibit 1.

14 DATED: June 30, 2021

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
 SULLIVAN, LLP

By /s/ Andrew H. Schapiro

Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com
 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700
 Chicago, IL 60606
 Telephone: (312) 705-7400
 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605)
 stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com
 Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526)
 violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com
 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90017
 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
 dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com
 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 801-5000

1 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

2 Josef Ansorge (admitted *pro hac vice*)
3 josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
4 Carl Spilly (admitted *pro hac vice*)
5 carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
6 1300 I. Street, N.W., Suite 900
7 Washington, D.C. 20005
8 Telephone: 202-538-8000
9 Facsimile: 202-538-8100

10 Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted *pro hac vice*)
11 jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
12 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
13 New York, NY 10010
14 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
15 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

16 Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
17 jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com
18 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
19 San Francisco, CA 94111
20 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
21 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

22 *Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC*
23
24
25
26
27
28